



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,680	06/27/2001	Anil K. Kumar	INTL-0598-US (P11739)	3966

7590 11/18/2004

Timothy N. Trop
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
STE 100
8554 KATY FWY
HOUSTON, TX 77024-1805

EXAMINER

BARNIE, REXFORD N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2643

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/892,680	Applicant(s) KUMAR, ANIL K.	
	Examiner REXFORD N BARNIE	Art Unit 2643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07/19/2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11, 13-15, 17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Korpela (US pat# 6,311,054).

Regarding claim 1, Korpela teaches a method to determine charging information in a mobile unit wherein one can establish a plurality of communication sessions simultaneously and then billed according in (see col. 5 lines22-24 and col. 5).

Regarding claim 2, Korpela teaches calculating charges for a plurality of call including a voice call and data call.

Regarding claim 3 and 5, Korpela teaches possibility of real-time charges which could factor in a quality of service (see disclosure).

Regarding claim 7, Korpela teaches a method to determine charging information in a mobile unit wherein one can establish a plurality of communication sessions simultaneously and then billed according in (see col. 5 lines22-24 and col. 5).

Regarding claim 8, Korpela teaches calculating charges for a plurality of call including a voice call and data call.

Art Unit: 2643

Regarding claims 9 and 11, Korpela teaches possibility of real-time charges which could factor in a quality of service (see disclosure).

Regarding claim 13, Korpela teaches a method to determine charging information in a mobile unit wherein one can establish a plurality of communication sessions simultaneously and then billed according in (see col. 5 lines 22-24, col. 5 and fig. 3).

Regarding claim 14, Korpela teaches calculating charges for a plurality of call including a voice call and data call.

Regarding claim 15 and 17, Korpela teaches possibility of real-time charges which could factor in a quality of service (see disclosure).

Regarding claims 19 and 20, Korpela teaches these limitations in (see cols. 4-5).

Claims 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shobatake et al. (US Pat# 6,654,607).

Regarding claims 21-26, Shobatake et al. teaches a method of assessing charges for a call in part by using mobility management information and also, whether a call is a roaming or non-roaming call (location information) in (see col. 6 line 53, col. 7 line 57-67, col. 8 lines 46-53, figs. 11, 12).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2643

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 6, 10, 12, 16, 18 and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korpela (US pat# 6,311,054) in view of Keller et al. (US Pat# 6,496,689).

Regarding claims 4, 6, 10, 12, 16 and 18; Korpela teaches monitoring charges associated with usage in a telephone terminal but fails to teach the claimed limitations.

Keller et al. teaches an indication of charge information (advice of charge) information in (see col.4) in addition to location information/mobility management information, all to be used in assessing charges in (see col.5-9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Keller into that of Korpela thus making it possible to determine charges accurately based on factors including roaming and to inform a user accordingly.

Regarding claims 21 and 24, Korpela teaches a method to determine charging information in a mobile unit wherein one can establish a plurality of communication sessions simultaneously and then billed according in (see col. 5 lines 22-24 and col. 5).

Korpela teaches monitoring charges associated with usage in a telephone terminal but fails to teach the claimed limitations including mobility management information.

Art Unit: 2643

Keller et al. teaches an indication of charge information (advice of charge) information in (see col.4) in addition to location information/mobility management information, all to be used in assessing charges in (see col.5-9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Keller into that of Korpela thus making it possible to determine charges accurately based on factors including roaming and to inform a user accordingly.

Regarding claims 22, 23, 25, 26 and 28-30, the combination teaches taken into location information which could include roaming and so forth in (see col.5 of Keller). Furthermore, billing based on roaming is well known in the art.

Regarding claim 27, Korpela teaches a method to determine charging information in a mobile unit wherein one can establish a plurality of communication sessions simultaneously and then billed according in (see col. 5 lines 22-24, col. 5 and fig.3).

Korpela teaches monitoring charges associated with usage in a telephone terminal but fails to teach the claimed limitations including mobility management information.

Keller et al. teaches an indication of charge information (advice of charge) information in (see col.4) in addition to location information/mobility management information, all to be used in assessing charges in (see col.5-9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Keller into that of Korpela

Art Unit: 2643

thus making it possible to determine charges accurately based on factors including roaming and to inform a user accordingly.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **REXFORD N BARNIE** whose telephone number is (703)306-2744. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, CURTIS KUNTZ can be reached on (703) 305-4708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PRIMARY EXAMINER
REXFORD BARNIE
11/15/04


REXFORD BARNIE
PRIMARY EXAMINER